1	BEFORE THE ARIZO	ONA CORPO	ORATION CO	OMMISSION	
2	COMMISSIONERS	Arizona Corpo	oration Commission	RECEI	VED
3	JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman WILLIAM A. MUNDELL	•			V L
4	MARC SPITZER MIKE GLEASON		2 0 2005	JAN 2 4	•
5	KRISTIN K. MAYES	DOCKETE	ne A	Corporation Director Of	Commission Utilities
6	IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT APPL	ICATION	DOCKETI	NO. L-00000C-	
7	OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COM AND CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS			NO. L-00000C- NO. L-00000F-0	
8	COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY	FOR A	•		
9	PROPOSED 345 KV TRANSMISSION L SYSTEM FROM TUCSON ELECTRIC F	INE			
10	COMPANY'S EXISTING SOUTH 345 K SUBSTATION IN SEC. 36, T. 16S., R.13	V			
11	SAHUARITA, ARIZONA, TO THE PRO GATEWAY 345/115 KV SUBSTATION	POSED			
12	12, T.24S., R.13E., NOGALES, ARIZON, 115 KV INTERCONNECTION TO THE	A WITH A		40	
13	COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY'S 115 VALENCIA SUBSTATION IN NOGALE	KV	DECISION	NO67:	509
14	ARIZONA, WITH A 345 KV TRANSMIS LINE FROM THE PROPOSED GATEWA	SSION			
15	SUBSTATION SOUTH TO THE				
16	INTERNATIONAL BORDER IN SEC. 13 R.13E.	3, 1.248.,	<u>ORDER</u>		
17					
18	Open Meeting January 11 and 12, 2005 Phoenix, Arizona				
19	BY THE COMMISSION:				
20		lectric Dove	Common. (47	י או אינים	
21	On December 3, 2004, Tucson El				
22	Services, Inc. ("UES") (collectively, "Joint Certificate of Environmental Compatibility			to Extend Time	Elimitation of
23	Certificate of Environmental Compatibility	,			
24	In their Motion, the Joint Appli	icants ask t	hat the Arizo	na Corporation	Commission
25	("Commission"):				
26	1. Extend the time limitation of	the CEC, pri	or to January 1	5, 2005;	
27	The Motion was captioned using the docket number	rs from the CEC	Capplication as we	ell as Docket No. E	L010324 00
00	0401, a docket concerning service quality and other is consolidated, and separate orders will be issued for e	issues in Santa (Cruz County, howe	ever, the dockets ha	ive not been
- !!		•			

13

16

19

21

23

24

25 26

27

28

2. Re-open the record in consolidated Docket Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 for the limited purpose of reviewing alternatives to the approved Preferred Route based upon information that has come to light after the issuance of Decision No. 64356^2 ;

- 3. Convene a procedural conference to establish the scope, forum and schedule for the proceeding in the re-opened consolidated dockets; and
- 4. Waive the requirement in Decision No. 67151 (August 3, 2004) that the Federal Agency Records of Decision ("RODs") be provided with this Motion.

On December 14, 2004, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed a Response to the Joint Applicant's Motion.

In its Response, Staff requests that the Commission:

- 1. Grant an indefinite extension of time for the CEC beyond January 15, 2005, until the conclusion of all proceedings related to Docket Nos. E-01032A-99-0401, L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111.
- 2. Bifurcate Dockets Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 from Docket No. E-01032A-99-0401, and send the former dockets back to the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee ("Committee").
- For Docket No. E-01032A-99-0401, establish a procedural schedule, including the 3. filing of pre-filed testimony by UES and TEP, and from any intervenors, and a Staff Report.
- Grant the request by TEP and UES to waive the requirement that RODs be filed with 4. their motion, so long as the final EIS and any corresponding RODs are filed by them as soon as they are publicly available.

BACKGROUND

On October 20, 1998, Citizens Utilities Company ("Citizens") filed with the Commission a notice of intent to form a holding company (Docket No. E-01032A-98-0611 et al). During the course

² See Reporter's Special Open Meeting Transcript of Proceedings at 126.

of reviewing Citizens' application, the Commission issued Decision No. 61383 (January 29, 1999) which ordered Citizens to file an "Analysis of Alternatives and Plan of Action (Plan) to rectify the service problems in its Santa Cruz Electric Division. . . [t]he Plan should include a cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, the alternative chosen and proposed deadlines for implementation of the alternative chosen." (Decision No. 61383 at 2) In June of 1999, Citizens notified the Commission that the proposed reorganization would not take place, and by Procedural Order issued July 15, 1999, the holding company docket was closed and Docket No. E-0132A-99-0401 (the "Service Quality" docket) was opened to resolve the Commission's concerns regarding Citizens' Santa Cruz Electric Division.

On October 27, 1998, the City of Nogales, Arizona, filed a Complaint against Citizens concerning electrical outages in Nogales, Arizona (Docket No. E-01032B-98-0621). In its Complaint, the City of Nogales alleged that numerous electric outages caused by Citizens' failure to adequately maintain its transmission lines and back-up generation capacity had resulted in economic damages to Nogales and its residents and endangered the community's welfare. The City of Nogales and Citizens entered into a Settlement Agreement, and in Decision No. 61793 (June 29, 1999), the Commission dismissed the Complaint and ordered that Citizens provide a planned service date and cost-benefit analysis for system components of a second transmission line in the Plan of Action to be filed in compliance with Decision No. 61383.

In August 1999, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff and Citizens filed a Settlement Agreement regarding Citizens' Plan of Action, in the Service Quality Docket. The Settlement Agreement, which was approved by the Commission in Decision No. 62011 (November 2, 1999), committed Citizens to a Plan of Action which included a requirement that Citizens build a second transmission line to serve its customers in Santa Cruz County by December 31, 2003; established a schedule for obtaining a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility ("CEC") and penalties if the schedule is not met; required an acquiring entity to fulfill Citizens' obligation for a second transmission line; preserved Staff's right to challenge any capital expenditure associated with constructing the Plan of Action; and adopted the parties' agreement that a ruling on expenditures should be postponed until a filing is made to recover costs.

DECISION NO. 67509

On March 1, 2001, TEP and Citizens filed a Joint Application for a CEC. In Decision No. 64356 (January 15, 2002), the Commission granted the CEC to construct the proposed Gateway 345 kV and 115kV Transmission Project ("Gateway Project" or "Project") for the preferred western route, which had been granted by the Committee. The Gateway Project incorporated the second transmission line required by Decision No. 62011. Need for the Gateway Project was established in that docket.

On August 5, 2003, TEP and Citizens filed a "Joint Application for Delay of the In-Service Deadline, or in the Alternative, Waiver of Penalties and For Other Appropriate Relief" in the Service Quality Docket. The Joint Applicants stated that additional time was necessary to obtain the required approvals from federal agencies. On October 10, 2003, TEP and UniSource Electric, Inc. ("UNS Electric") filed a supplement.³ The supplement proposed to provide short-term relief until the second transmission line was constructed and became operational. In Decision No. 66615 (December 10, 2003), the Commission waived the penalty provided for in the Settlement Agreement approved in Decision No. 62011, until June 1, 2004; ordered TEP and UNS Electric to submit an updated "Outage Response Plan"; and ordered Staff to file a Report on the sufficiency of the updated Outage Response Plan.

On February 9, 2004, TEP and UniSource Energy Services, Inc. ("UES") filed their updated Outage Response Plan and on March 11 and May 27, 2004, Staff filed its Staff Reports regarding the sufficiency of the updated Outage Response Plan.

On July 23, 2004, Defenders of Wildlife & Sky Island Alliance filed an "Application to Rescind Decision No. 64356 (Dockets L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111) and to Reopen for Consideration The Fulfillment of Decision No. 62011".

On July 28, 2004, the Commission held a Special Open Meeting in Tucson, Arizona to review the status of compliance with Decision No. 62011 and the requested waiver of penalties. During the Special Open Meeting, the Commissioners discussed whether intervening circumstances, the passage of time, and what may be inconsistent results reached by the Committee and the Department of

³ Citizens sold its assets to UniSource Energy Corporation ("UNS") which formed UniSource Energy Services, Inc. (UES"). UNS is also the parent holding company for TEP. Citizens' CEC was transferred to UES.

Agriculture Forest Service necessitate the re-opening of the record in the Line Siting dockets. The
Commissioners directed TEP and UES to reopen the docket in Decision No. 64356 granting the
CEC.⁴ Further, the Commissioners discussed the issues of reliability and need for a second
transmission line, and indicated that these issues were appropriate for a hearing before a Commission
Administrative Law Judge. The Commissioners expressed an interest in having this issue handled on
a faster track, and invited parties to file pleadings in the event that they thought there were alternative
ideas relating to the reliability issue in Santa Cruz County.⁵ No such pleadings have been filed since
the Special Open Meeting.

On August 3, 2004, the Commission issued Decision No. 67151 which waived the penalty

On August 3, 2004, the Commission issued Decision No. 67151 which waived the penalty provision of the Settlement Agreement approved in Decision No. 62011 indefinitely, subject to numerous conditions contained in the order.

DISCUSSION

Decision No. 64356 affirming the grant of the CEC contained a condition that authorization to construct the Project would expire three years from the date of the Decision. In Decision No. 67151, issued in August of 2004, the Commission authorized the Joint Applicants to seek an extension of that time limit. Without an extension, the CEC would expire January 15, 2005. Staff believes that since the Commission wants the record in the dockets to be re-opened to review information that has come to light after the CEC was granted, extending the time beyond January 15, 2005 is appropriate. Further, certain Federal Agencies must grant approval or permits prior to construction. No party to the dockets has objected to either the re-opening of the dockets, nor to the extension of the CEC approval.

Given the intervening circumstances, the passage of time, and what may be inconsistent results reached by the Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee and the Federal Agencies, including the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the record in Dockets L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 should be re-opened and referred to the Committee for further fact finding, review, and consideration.

Transcript at 54

DECISION NO.

⁴ Transcript at 53, 54, 55

Although Decision No. 67151 indicated that a completed Federal Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") and associated Records of Decisions should be filed with a motion for extension of time limit, the Joint Applicants were unable to file such documents because they are not yet available. Accordingly, we will require the Joint Applicants to file the EIS and any RODs as soon as they are publicly available.

* * * * * * * * *

Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. In Decision No. 62011 (November 2, 1999), the Commission approved a Settlement Agreement between Staff and Citizens which committed Citizens to a Plan of Action which included a requirement that Citizens build a second transmission line to serve its customers in Santa Cruz County by December 31, 2003; established a schedule for obtaining a CEC and penalties if the schedule is not met; required an acquiring entity to fulfill Citizens' obligation for a second transmission line; preserved Staff's right to challenge any capital expenditure associated with constructing the Plan of Action; and adopted the parties' agreement that a ruling on expenditures should be postponed until a filing is made to recover costs.
 - 2. On March 1, 2001, TEP and Citizens filed a Joint Application for a CEC.
- 3. In Decision No. 64356 (January 15, 2002), the Commission granted the CEC to construct the proposed Gateway 345 kV and 115kV Transmission Project for the preferred western route, which had been granted by the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee. The Gateway Project incorporated the second transmission line required by Decision No. 62011.
- 4. On August 5, 2003, TEP and Citizens filed a "Joint Application for Delay of the In-Service Deadline, or in the Alternative, Waiver of Penalties and For Other Appropriate Relief" in the Service Quality Docket.
 - 5. On October 10, 2003, TEP and UNS Electric filed a supplement.
- 6. In Decision No. 66615 (December 10, 2003), the Commission waived the penalty provided for in the Settlement Agreement approved in Decision No. 62011, until June 1, 2004;

ordered TEP and UNS Electric to submit an updated "Outage Response Plan"; and ordered Staff to file a Report on the sufficiency of the updated Outage Response Plan.

- 7. On February 9, 2004, TEP and UES filed their updated Outage Response Plan and on March 11 and May 27, 2004, Staff filed its Staff Reports regarding the sufficiency of the updated Outage Response Plan.
- 8. On July 23, 2004, Defenders of Wildlife & Sky Island Alliance filed an Application to Rescind Decision No. 64356 (Dockets L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111) and to Reopen for Consideration The Fulfillment of Decision No. 62011.
- 9. On July 28, 2004, the Commission held a Special Open Meeting in Tucson, Arizona to review the status of compliance with Decision No. 62011 and the requested waiver of penalties. During the Special Open Meeting, the Commissioners discussed whether intervening circumstances, the passage of time, and what may be inconsistent results reached by the Line Siting Committee and the Department of Agriculture Forest Service necessitate the re-opening of the record in the Line Siting docket. The Commissioners directed TEP and UES to reopen the docket in Decision No. 64356 granting the CEC.
- 10. On August 3, 2004, the Commission issued Decision No. 67151 which waived the penalty provision of the Settlement Agreement approved in Decision No. 62011 indefinitely, subject to numerous conditions contained in the order.
- 11. On December 3, 2004, the Joint Applicants filed a Motion to Extend Time Limitation of Certificate of Environmental Compatibility.
- 12. In their Motion, the Joint Applicants ask that the Commission: 1) extend the time limitation of the CEC, prior to January 15, 2005; 2) re-open the record in consolidated Docket Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 for the limited purpose of reviewing alternatives to the approved Preferred Route based upon information that has come to light after the issuance of Decision No. 64356; 3) convene a procedural conference to establish the scope, forum and schedule for the proceeding in the re-opened consolidated dockets; and 4) waive the requirement in Decision No. 67151 (August 3, 2004) that the Federal Agency Records of Decision be provided with the Motion.

6

10

13 14

> 16 17

15

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

- On December 14, 2004, Staff filed a Response to the Joint Applicants' Motion 13. requesting that the Commission: 1) grant an indefinite extension of time for the CEC beyond January 15, 2005, until the conclusion of all proceedings related to Docket Nos. E-01032A-99-0401, L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111; 2) Bifurcate Dockets Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 from Docket No. E-01032A-99-0401, and send the former dockets back to the Committee; 3) for Docket No. E-01032A-99-0401, establish a procedural schedule, including the filing of pre-filed testimony by UES and TEP, and from any intervenors, and a Staff Report; 4) grant the request by TEP and UES to waive the requirement that RODs be filed with their motion, so long as the final EIS and any corresponding RODs are filed by them as soon as they are publicly available.
- Given the intervening circumstances, the passage of time, and what may be 14. inconsistent results reached by the Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee and the Federal Agencies, including the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the record in Dockets L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 should be re-opened and referred to the Line Siting for further fact finding, review, and consideration.
- 15. Pursuant to Decision No. 67151, the Joint Applicants were to have filed the completed Federal EIS and associated RODs with the motion for extension of time limit, however, the Joint Applicants were unable to file such documents because they are not yet unavailable.
- 16. The Joint Applicants should file the EIS and any RODs as soon as they are publicly available.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. TEP and UNS Electric are public service corporations within the meaning of Article XV, Section 2 of the Arizona Constitution.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over TEP and UNS Electric and over the subject matter of this docket.
- 3. There is good cause to grant the Motion to Extend Time Limitation of Certificate of Environmental Compatibility.
- 4. There is good cause to waive the requirement of Decision No. 67151 that Federal Agency Records of Decision and Federal Environmental Impact Statement accompany the Motion to

1 Extend Time Limitation. There is good cause to re-open the record in Docket Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-2 5. 00000F-01-0111 to review alternatives to the approved Preferred Route based upon information that 3 has come to light after the issuance of Decision No. 64356 and to review the evidence presented in 4 5 Docket No. E-01032A-99-0401, pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-360.06, the Committee and the Commission will review the 6. 6 7 new information and make the appropriate determinations. 8 ORDER 9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Motion to Extend Time Limitation of Certificate of Environmental Compatibility is granted and the authorization to construct the Project will expire one 10 year from the date that all required approvals have been obtained. 11 12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Docket Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111 13 are re-opened and referred to the Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee to review 14 alternatives to the approved Preferred Route based upon information that has come to light after the 15 issuance of Decision No. 64356 and to review the evidence presented in Docket No. E-01032A-99-16 0401, pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252. 17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that neither Tucson Electric Power nor UniSource shall 18 commence construction of a second transmission line to Santa Cruz County until a new decision is 19 issued in Docket Nos. L-00000C-01-0111 and L-00000F-01-0111. 20 . . . 21 22 23 24 25

67509

DECISION NO.

26

27

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that TEP and UNS Electric shall file the final Environmental Impact Statement and any Federal Agencies Records of Decisions with the Commission as soon as they are made publicly available. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately. BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION. COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix. this 20+ day of Jan. , 2005. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY DISSENT DISSENT _____

1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY et al.
2	DOCKET NOS.:	L-00000C-01-0111, L-00000F-01-0111
3 4 5	Laurie A. Woodall, Chairman Arizona Power Plan and Transmission Line Siting Committee Office of the Attorney General 1275 W. Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007	Donald Weinstein Sonoita Crossroads Community Forum 21 Toledo Road P.O. Box 288 Sonoita, AZ 85637
6 7 8	Steven Glaser Tucson Electric Power Company P.O. Box 711 Tucson, AZ 85702	William L. and Ellen L. Kurtz HC 65 Box 7990 Amado, AZ 85645 David Hodges
9	Nathan B. Hannah Jeffrey R. Simmons DeConcini McDonald Yetwin & Lacy 2525 E. Broadway, Ste. 200	Ecosystem Defense & Policy Director Sky Island Alliance P.O. Box 41165 Tucson, AZ 85717
11 12	Tucson, AZ 85716 Attorneys for Inscription Canyon Ranch	Bob Witzeman Maricopa Audubon Society 4619 E. Arcadia Lane
13	Jose L. Machado City Attorney	Phoenix, AZ 85018
14 15	City of Nogales 777 North Grand Avenue Nogales, AZ 85621	Emilio E. Falco P.O. Box 3371 Tubac, AZ 85646
16 17	Steven J. Duffy Ridge & Isaacson 3101 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 1090 Phoenix, AZ 85012	Jean England Neibauer Rock Corral Ranch P.O. Box 177 Tumacacori, AZ 85640
18 19 20	Holly J. Hawn Martha S. Chase Santa Cruz County Attorney 2150 N. Congress Drive, Ste. 201 Nogales, AZ 85621	Lainie Levick Sierra Club, Rincon Group 738 N. 5 th Avenue, No. 214 Tucson, AZ 85705
21 22 23	Timothy M. Hogan Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest 202 E. McDowell Road, Ste. 153 Phoenix, AZ 85004	Tucson, AZ 85701
24 25	Jeffrey Harris Public Service Company of New Mexico 2401 Aztec Road NE, MSZ245 Albuquerque, NM 87107	Michele L. Lorenzen Ryley Carlock & Applewhite One North Central, Ste. 1200 Phoenix, AZ 85004
12	Thomas Campbell Lewis & Roca 40 N. Central Phoenix, AZ 85004	Walter Meek Arizona Utility Investors Association 2100 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 210 Phoenix, AZ 85004

Raymond S. Heyman Lawrence Robertson RÓSHKA HEYMAN & DeWULF 1 Munger Chadwick 400 E. Van Buren, Ste. 800 333 N. Wilmot Road, Ste. 300 Phoenix, AZ 85004 Tucson, AZ 85621 Jeanine A. Derby Stephen Ahearn Coronado National Forest Supervisor's Office 3 RÚCO Forest Service 1110 W. Washington Street, Ste. 220 U.S. Department of Agriculture 4 Phoenix, AZ 85007 300 West Congress 5 Tucson, AZ 85701 Marshall McGruder P.O. Box 1267 Shela McFarlin 6 Tubac, AZ 85646 Field Manager USDI BLM Tucson Field Office Paul W. Ramussen 7 12661 East Broadway ADEQ Tucson, AZ 85478 1110 W. Washington 8 Phoenix, AZ 85007 Linda Beals 9 Manager, Right-of-Way Section Gregg Houtz ADWR Arizona State Land Department 10 1616 West Adams Street 500 N. Third Street Phoenix, AZ 85007 Phoenix, AZ 85004-3903 11 Lori Faeth Mark McWhirter Policy Advisor for Natural Resources and AZ Dept. of Commerce Energy 2nd Floor North, Suite 220 12 Environment Executive Office of the Governor 1700 W. Washington Street 13 State of Arizona Phoenix, AZ 85007 1700 West Washington 14 Phoenix, AZ 85007 A. Wayne Smith 6106 S. 32nd Street Phoenix, AZ 85040 15 Paul Johnson, Sr. White House Task Force 1000 Independence Avenue SW 16 Hon. Sandie Smith Pinal County Board of Supervisors Washington, DC 20585 17 575 N. Idaho Road, #101 Apache Junction, AZ 85219 18 Anthony Como Jeff McGuire Deputy Director - Electric Power Regulation P.O. Box 1046 19 U.S. Department of Energy Sun City, AZ 85372 Office of Fossil Energy 20 1000 Independence Avenue, Southwest Hon. Mike Whalen Mesa City Council Washington, D.C. 20585 21 P.O. Box 1466 Mesa, AZ 85211 22 Richard F. Ahern, Esq. Margaret Trujillo US DOE, Room 6A-113, GC-51, 23 Maricopa County RBHA 1000 Independence Avenue., SW Service Integration Officer – Value Options 444 N. 44th Street, Suite 400 Washington, D.C. 20585 Phoenix, AZ 85008 Stephen Tencza & Glenn Hansel 25 Ray Williamson International Boundary and Water Utilities Engineer 26 Commission ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 865 Rio Rico Industrial Park 1200 W. Washington Street 27 Phoenix, AZ 85007 Rio Rico, AZ 85648

67509

1	Brian Segee Defenders of Wildlife
2	1130 Seventeenth Street NW Washington, DC 20036-4604
3	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
5	Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007
6	Ernest G. Johnson, Director
7	Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street
8	Phoenix, AZ 85007
9	
10	,
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

•					
			•		•
	214				
	·				
			•		
		•			
				•	